

United States I Lent and Trademark Office



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address **OMMISSA** NEICO OF FATUNTS AND TRADEMARKS Washington 10** 20231 www.usptogev

APPLICATION NO.	FI	LING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKEL NO	CONFIRMATION NO
09 770,289	(01 29 2001	Atsushi Shiota	202450US0	6290
22850	7590	06 24 2002			
		ICCLELLAND M	EXAMINER		
	RSON DA	VIS HIGHWAY	FEELY, MICHAEL J		
ARLINGIC	ARLINGTON, VA 22202				PAPER NUMBER

1712 DATE MAILED: 06 24/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Application No.	Applicant(s)					
	Office Action Summer	09/770,289	SHIOTA ET AL.					
	Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit					
		Michael J Feely	1712					
	The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply							
THE N - Extension after S - If the p - If NO - Failum - Any re	DRTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. sions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1 13 SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period we to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, sply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing dipatent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1 704(b)	within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days a peply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONE	nely filed s will be considered timely the mailing date of this communication D (35 U S C § 133)					
1) 💽	Responsive to communication(s) filed on 23 M	<u>lay 2002</u> .						
2a) ⊡	This action is FINAL . 2b) Thi	s action is non-final.						
3)	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.							
	on of Claims							
· —	4) Claim(s) 1-16 is/are pending in the application.							
	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.							
	5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.							
	Claim(s) <u>1-15</u> is/are rejected.							
	Claim(s) <u>16</u> is/are objected to.							
	Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	election requirement.						
	on Papers							
9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.								
10)[1	The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) ☐ accep							
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). 11) The proposed drawing correction filed on is: a) approved b) disapproved by the Examiner.								
11)[[oved by the Examiner.					
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.								
12)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.								
·	nder 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120							
	13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f)							
a)[a)⊠ All_b)□ Some * c)□ None of:							
	1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.							
	2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No							
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received 								
Attachment		A CONTRACTOR OF THE STATE OF TH	Piloto .					
	e of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) Interview Summary	y (PTO-413) Paper No(s)					
2 Notice	e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review IPTO 048 out in 179 Together through the 1884 of Egyptic Services		transfer of the state of the st					

Art Unit: 1712

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Objections

1. The objection to claim 3 has been overcome by amendment.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102/103

- 2. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.
- 3. The rejection of claims 1-7 and 9-15 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over Treadwell et al. (US Pat. No. 6.177,143), stands for the reasons set forth in paragraph 5 of paper #5.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The rejection of claim 8 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Treadwell et al. (US Pat. No. 6,177,143), stands for the reasons set forth in paragraph 6 of paper #5.

Allowable Subject Matter

- 5. Claim 16 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.
- 6. The prior art fails to teach or suggest the process of claim 1, wherein the irradiation dose is from 1 to 200 μ C/cm². Treadwell et al. teaches a range of about 500 to about 100,000 μ C/cm².

Response to Amendment

7. The reply filed on May 23, 2002 is not fully responsive becomes in fail the factor to the

made note that the interview took place; however, the substance of the interview was not

Application Control Number: 09/770,289 Page 3

Art Unit: 1712

addressed. Applicant failed to discuss the agreement reached between the Examiner and Applicant's representative to further limit claim 1 to include an irradiation dose of from 1 to 200 $\mu\text{C/cm}^2$.

Response to Arguments

8. Applicant's arguments filed May 23, 2002 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Regarding claims 1-15, Applicant argues that although Treadwell et al. disclose a dosage range of about 500 to about $100,000~\mu\text{C/cm}^2$, Treadwell et al. fails to suggest the claimed dosage range of from 1 to $500~\mu\text{C/cm}^2$ because the examples of Treadwell et al. disclose a minimum electron dose of $6.000~\mu\text{C/cm}^2$. The Treadwell et al. reference does not have show experimental results of the entire dosage range to qualify the reference as applicable prior art. Treadwell et al. explicitly disclose a dosage range of about 500 to about $100,000~\mu\text{C/cm}^2$ (column 7, lines 22-24). The range overlaps the claimed range; therefore, the rejection stands.

Conclusion

9. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE MONTHS are as a local set.

CER 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event,

Application/Control Number: 09/770,289 Page 4
Art Unit: 1712

however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Michael J Feely whose telephone number is 703-305-0268. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:30 to 5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Robert Dawson can be reached on 703-308-2340. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-872-9310 for regular communications and 703-872-9311 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-0661.

Michael J. Feely June 20, 2002 Robert an Sawon